

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
02/01/2001	Luther Stoddard	. 17427-US	1172
90 03/30/2004		EXAMINER	
singer	•	KIM, EUG	ENE LEE
ooth		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
201 4544		3721	
)	02/01/2001 00 03/30/2004 singer oth	02/01/2001 Luther Stoddard 00 03/30/2004 singer oth	02/01/2001 Luther Stoddard 17427-US 0 03/30/2004 EXAM singer oth ART UNIT 3721

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1,	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/701,478	STODDARD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eugene L Kim	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of th will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed inty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M	arch 2004.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.	er i de la companya d	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	ice except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-19 is/are pending in the appli			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw5) ☐ Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.	WIT HOITI CONSIDERATION.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 4-10, 12-19</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	,,		
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	*	
2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in	Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have bee	n received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	5) D Notice of	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	<u> </u>	

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (CA 2064270) in view of Andersson et al (#5,155,799).

Davis substantially shows the claimed method and apparatus including flattening a neck portion, gathering the flattened portion and attaching a reusable closure 25 to the neck. Davis also shows belt means 15, brush means 13 and perforating means as claimed. Figure 2 shows the sealing means 17 and gripping means 15 to grip the end while sealing. Davis shows gripping the bag with gripping means 15 while the bag is sealed and perforated. Davis shows heating means 17 to seal the web but does not show the hot air means as claimed. Andersson et al teach the concept of sealing webs using heated air means. Andersson et al disclose that hot air has advantages with regard to rapid and concentrated heating (col 2 lines 8+). The heated air is disclosed as having a temperature range between 300 and 500 degrees Celsius. Andersson et al also discloses that the hot air is distributed to two nozzle jets 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Davis with hot air means as taught by Andersson et al to provide the advantages with rapid and concentrating heating means. Regarding the location of parts, such as, the location of air dispensers, the examiner notes that little patentable weight is given to the location of parts unless there is some criticality or unexpected result from the location. See in re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

Art Unit: 3721

Regarding the temperature as claimed, Andersson et al show a temperature range as discussed supra. Optimum ranges via experimentation are known and little patentable weight is given unless the particular range imparts new and unexpected result, which are different in kind, and not merely degree. See in re Dreyfus, 22 CCPA (Patents) 830, 73 F.2d 9312, in re Waite et al, 35 CCPA (Patents) 1117, 168 F.2d 104.

2. Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis

Davis shows a product tampering sealed bags that enclose bakery products (p. 3 lines 5+), with a reclosable bag with a row of perforations forming a tamper evident tear of strip. Davis discloses that the reclosable closure member may be wire, tape, plastic clip etc... (p. 8 lines 3+). Regarding the ink on the neck, Davis shows a bag code pressed in the neck rather than including anything in than including anything in the printing inks, etc.. The examiner reads this claim in a the way of printing inks etc (p. 7 5th paragraph) in a broad context. The ink is claimed as it may be softened by heat which is a capability type limitation. Davis discloses that printing inks are known but rather uses a pressed bag code to provide information or identity to the bag. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use ink which is a mechanical equivalent to the bar code of Davis since ink does not solve any stated problem.

Furthermore, applicant concedes that it is known to provide bakery products with printed bags in p. 9 5th paragraph of the remarks on 12/17/2002. The examiner also notes that it is well known in the art to heat inks to imprint on material webs as claimed.

3. Claim 11 is allowed.

Art Unit: 3721

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/12/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants arguments regarding the location of where the heating means apply, the examiner notes that Andersson et al disclose that it is known to restrict the heating to a defined region that may be readily regulated (col 1 lines 30+). The actual location of where the heat is applied is a matter of where the user wants to create a seal/bond to close the bag.

In response to the perforated neck, Davis does show a seal line that is adjacent and spaced from a row or perforations. The secondary reference is being used to show an alternative mechanism to form the seal lines. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to provide Davis with heat sealing means as taught by Andersson et al to create a heat seal in a defined region that may be readily regulated.

In response to applicants argument regarding claim 4 and claim 12, the examiner reads these claim in a broad context as discussed supra. The ink is claimed as "may be softened by heat" which is a capability type limitation.

Art Unit: 3721

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene L Kim whose telephone number is 703 308-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 703 308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eugene L Kim Primary Examiner Art Unit 3721